



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/809,034

03/25/2004

Robert Allan Young

PUS-P001-041

5815

35246 7590 11/14/2007  
MOETTELI & ASSOCIES SARL  
CASE POSTALE 486  
GENEVA, CH-1211  
SWITZERLAND

EXAMINER

SHAFFER, RICHARD R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3733

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/14/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Interview Summary

Application No.

10/809,034

Applicant(s)

YOUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Richard R. Shaffer

Art Unit

3733

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Richard R. Shaffer.

(3) Eduardo Robert.

(2) John Moetteli.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claims 1 and 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Weaver et al (US Patent 6,623,486), Steffee (US Patent 4,611,581), Niederberger (WO 02/096309 A1), and Dupuis (FR 2472373).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
EDUARDO C. ROBERT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 11/8/07  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative, John Moetteli, contacted the office to discuss the previous office action as well as proposed claim amendments. In regards to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection, it was deemed that the combination was improper due to the slots not being threaded. Therefore, the previous art rejection would be withdrawn and additional search as well as consideration (over Niederberger and Dupuis) would be conducted in a future Office Action after amendment. It was stated that should a new art rejection be employed in the future, that applicant's representative would be contacted if such required minor amendments for allowance. In regard to the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, language was recommended removing limitations directed to non-disclosed radii and distances between centers of holes, as well as better defining necked down portion. Applicant's representative stated that such should pose no problem and that a response would be filed shortly.